

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

Angelica B. Wallace,

Plaintiff,

v.

Denis McDonough,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-00831-GMN-DJA

**Order**

On May 26, 2023, pro se Plaintiff Angelica B. Wallace filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF No. 1). The Court denied Plaintiff's application without prejudice and with leave to re-file, noting that it was missing certain information. Specifically, the Court pointed out that

Plaintiff claims that her only income is disability or worker's compensation payment, but she does not explain how much she receives. She also claims to make no money from employment, have no bills, have no property of any kind, have no dependents, and to have no debts. On the docket, Plaintiff includes an address. The Court takes judicial notice of the fact that public records reveal the address is an apartment complex. Plaintiff does not provide any details in the application regarding how she pays rent, how she pays utilities or other bills, or how she lives considering her claim to have no money and no bills. The Court finds that Plaintiff has omitted information from the application. As a result, the Court cannot determine whether Plaintiff qualifies for *in forma pauperis* status.

The Court thus informed Plaintiff that she would have one opportunity to file a complete *in forma pauperis* application. It added that

Plaintiff may not respond with a zero or "not applicable" in response to any question without providing an explanation for each of the questions. Plaintiff also may not leave any questions blank. Plaintiff must describe each source of money that she receives, state the amount she received, and what she expects to receive in the

1 future....Plaintiff must fully answer all applicable questions and  
2 check all applicable boxes

3 Plaintiff timely filed a second application. (ECF No. 4). However, that application has  
4 the same deficiencies as the first one. Plaintiff's second application includes the same responses  
5 as her first one. Plaintiff has not provided more details; included zero and "not applicable"  
6 responses to questions; and has not described the sources of money she receives, the amounts, and  
7 what she expects to receive in the future.

8 The Court will therefore deny Plaintiff's application and give her one final opportunity to  
9 file a complete application. The Court further orders that Plaintiff may not respond with a zero or  
10 "not applicable" in response to any question without providing an explanation for each of the  
11 questions. Plaintiff also may not leave any questions blank. Plaintiff must describe each source  
12 of money that she receives, state the amount she received, and what she expects to receive in the  
13 future.

14 The Court denies Plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* application without prejudice. The Court  
15 gives Plaintiff 30 days to file an updated application. Plaintiff must fully answer all applicable  
16 questions and check all applicable boxes. Plaintiff may alternatively pay the filing fee in full.  
17 Since the Court denies Plaintiff's application, it does not screen the complaint at this time.

18  
19 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma*  
20 *pauperis* (ECF No. 4) is **denied without prejudice**.

21 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff has until **September 6, 2023** to file an  
22 updated application to proceed *in forma pauperis* as specified in this order or pay the filing fee.  
23 Failure to timely comply with this order may result in a recommendation to the district judge that  
24 this case be dismissed.

25  
26 DATED: August 8, 2023

27   
28 DANIEL J. ALBRECHTS  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE